DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 430 CG 024 771

AUTHOR Barnett, Deanna L.
TITLE Fear of Success.
PUB DATE [91]
NOTE 86p.; M.S. Thesis, Fort Hays State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Fear of Success; Predictor Variables; Sex Differences; Sex Role; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

Results of previous studies have demonstrated the prevalence of fear of success (FOS). Originally thought to be a gender-related construct pertaining to women, studies have also found FOS was experienced by men, sometimes even more so than by women. Recent researchers have attributed FOS more to the Bem Sex Role for individuals who are traditional feminine or undifferentiated than for traditional masculine or androgynous individuals. This study examined fear of success among community college students (N=160), including 98 female and 62 male students. The community college serves a predominantly rural area. Four instruments were used: Fear of Success Scale; Bem Sex Role Inventory, Short Form; Personal Attributes Inventory; and a demographic sheet. The results of the study appeared to support these generalizations: (1) females have more fear of success than males; (2) there is no association between Bem Sex Role and fear of success; (3) there is no association between self-esteem and fear of success; (4) there is no association between age and fear of success; (5) there is no association between college classification and fear of success; (6) there is no association between grade point average and fear of success; and (7) there is no association between family structure and fear of success. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354430

FEAR OF SUCCESS

being

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of the Fort Hays State University in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for

the Degree of Master of Science

by

Deanna L. Barnett

B.A., Fort Hays State University

Date_____Approved_____
Major Professor

Approved_____
Chair, Graduate Council

CG024771

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Deanna L. Barnett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Graduate Committee Approval

The Graduate Committee of Deanna L. Barnett hereby approves her thesis as meeting partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science.

Approved_____
Chair, Graduate Committee

Approved_____
Committee Member

Approved_____
Committee Member

Approved_____
Committee Member

Date:_____

Acknowledgements

After long hours and hard work, I would like to take a moment to thank Dr. Daley, Dr. Stansbury, Dr. Guss, Dr. Bloss, Dr. Shaffer, and Dr. Chalender for their support, teaching, efforts, and patience giving me the courage to persevere and complete the Counseling program. Dr. Daley, in particular, gave me the incentive to keep trying along with having a sense of humor at my shortcomings. Even in anxious moments, Dr. Daley would listen patiently while I vented my frustration as well as offer insightful advice concerning the challenges I faced. Concerning the faculty of the Counseling program, I am indebted to you all. Thank you for being wonderful role models and confidantes. You are all dear to my heart.

Gratitude also goes out to Dr. Thomas Parish for allowing me to use the Personal Attribute Inventory, Miron Zuckerman and Stephen Allison for use of the Fear of Success Scale, and Sandra Bem for developing the Bem Sex Role Inventory and placing it in the public domain. Without the privilege of using these instruments,myendeavors would have been less successful.

Finally, I would like to thank the administration, faculty, and students of Colby Community College. President, Dr. Mikel Ary; Dean of Instruction, Gracemary Melvin; Dean of Student Services, Dr. Gary Schultz; Instructors, Roger Hale and Larry Coon; and the CCC students who participated by completing the surveys for this study were all instrumental in assisting me to conduct the research and complete the thesis.

In addition, my parents, Marvin and Alberta Barnett can take ownership in my accomplishments. They have witnessed the pain, anguish, hurt, and ultimate joy by seeing my life change in the course of the last four years. They should be proud and rejoice because the past is behind me and the future is what lies ahead. Life is meant for continually moving forward, learning from the mistakes we make, and becoming a better person from our experiences. My parents have instilled in my mind that ultimately I am responsible for what I make of my life; therefore, I will strive to achieve my highest potential. My work is cut out for me -- it should take a lifetime.

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction. 1

Definitions of Fear of Success 1

Fear of Success: An Overview 3

Gender, Bem Sex Role, and Fear of Success 7

Self-Esteem and Fear of Success 12

Age and Fear of Success 12

College Classification and Fear of Success. 12

Grade Point Average and Fear of Success 13

Family Structure and Fear of Success 13

Summary 13

Statement of the Problem. 13

Importance of the Research 14

Composite Null Hypotheses 15

Definition of Variables. 16

Independent Variables 17

Dependent Variable 18

Limitations. 18

Methodology 19
Setting 19
Subjects 20
Instruments 22
Fear of Success Scale 22
Bem Sex Role Inventory 24
Personal Attributes Inventory 24
Demographic Sheet 26
Design 26
Data Collecting Procedures 29
Research Procedures 31
Data Analysis. 32
Results 32
Discussion 43
Summary 43
Related Literature and Results of the Present Study. . 44
Generalizations 46
Recommendations 46
References. 49

List of Appendices

Page

A: Instruction Sheet 52

B: Fear of Success Scale 54

C: Fear of Success Scale Statistics 58

D: Personal Attributes Inventory 63

E: Bem Sex Role Inventory, Short Form 65

F: Demographic Sheet 67

G: Letter to M. Zuckerman 69

H: Letter to T. Parish 71

I: Letter to the Dean of Instruction at Colby Community College 73

List of Tables

Page

Table 1: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to the Bem Sex Role, Self-Esteem, and Gender Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance 34

Table 2: A comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to the Bem Sex Role, Self-Esteem, and Age Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance 36

Table 3: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to Self-Esteem, Gender, and Age Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance. 38

Table 4: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to the Bem Sex Role, Gender, and Age Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance. 40

Table 5: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to College Classification, Grade Point Average, and Family Structure Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance. 42

Abstract

The purpose of the researcher was to study fear of success among community college students. The sample included 160 students, 98 females and 62 males. The independent variables were gender, Bem Sex Role, self-esteem, age, college classification, grade point average, and family structure. The dependent variable was fear of success scores. Five composite null hypotheses were tested using three-way analysis of variance.

A total of 19 comparisons plus 13 recurring comparisons were made. Of the 19 comparisons, 7 were for main effects and 12 were for interactions. Of the 7 main effects, one was statistically significant at the .05 level. The significant main effect was for gender. The results indicated females had statistically more FOS than males. None of the 12 interactions were statistically significant at the .05 level.

The results of the present study appeared to support the following generalizations:

1. females have more fear of success than males,
2. no association between the Bem Sex Role and fear of

success,

3. no association between self-esteem and fear of success,
4. no association between age and fear of success,
5. no association between college classification and fear of success,
6. no association between grade point average and fear of success, and
7. no association between family structure and fear of success.

Introduction

Definitions of Fear of Success

Piedmont (1988) researched fear of success and achievement motivation based on Horner's theory. Fear of success (FOS) was defined as, "the expectancy held by some women that success in certain achievement-related situations will be followed by negative consequences....success is equated with a loss of femininity that will result in social rejection" (p. 468). Piedmont maintained sex-role expectancies gained during pre-adolescence determine gender identity and cultural norms dictate appropriate behaviors for each gender. Since competition and success are often classified as masculine characteristics, women are typically faced with an approach avoidance conflict and associate negative consequences, such as social isolation and loss of femininity, with success.

FOS affects motivation differently in men. Orlofsky (1978, cited by Piedmont, 1988, p. 471) stated that, "FOS in males is not so much FOS but some combination of (a) fear of failure, (b) the wish to avoid responsibilities that continued achievement of

success brings, and (c) a devaluation of the achievement ethic." Itzkowitz and Petrie (1982) defined fear of success as being associated with ".....alienation, loneliness, sadness, physical and/or emotional damage....." (p. 26). Successful women were described as mannish, ugly, unloved, and aggressive.

Paludi (1984) defined fear of success as simply the need to avoid success. She cited Horner by stating:

> .....in competitive achievement situations, especially those in which important men (i.e., prospective dates; boyfriends) are present, success-seeking women of high ability have not only (a) a motive to approach success and (b) a motive to avoid failure but also (c) a motive to become anxious about being successful.....such a motive is present because of the expectation of negative consequences as a result of succeeding (i.e., loss of feminity, social rejection, and disapproval). .....(Horner, 1969, cited by Paludi, 1984, p. 765)

The double bind women were caught up in was that in failure, they would not live up to their own expectations, and through success,

they would not live up to societal expectations for their gender.

Pappo (1983) defined FOS as,

> .....a psychological state which results in observable paralysis, withdrawal, or retraction in the presence of a consciously understood, subjective, or objective goal which is perceived by the individual at the moment of withdrawal. This 'consciously understood goal' is one which the individual can acknowledge to mean that success is an imminent possibility. (p. 36)

Fear of Success: An Overview

Piedmont (1988) conducted a study of FOS employing a sample of 146 introductory psychology students attending Boston University (58 males and 88 females). The measures used were the Adjective Check List (ACL), the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), the Fear of Success Scale (FOSS), the Attribution Scale, and a cognitive task.

Subjects completed the ACL, EPPS, and FOSS prior to receiving the experimental directions. Next, subjects were randomly assigned to one of 3 mixed sex groups. Each group then

received a different set of instructions. The instructions for each group were either male-oriented, female-oriented, or neutral. The intent was to produce differences in performance between males and females based on their expectations of success when receiving tasks that resembled gender-related abilities. All subjects were given the same cognitive word recognition task to complete.

Following completion of the task, the sample marked the attribution rating scale. It was postulated that the instructions would influence perceptions toward the task as being more relevant to one gender than the other. Male-oriented instructions given to males and female-oriented instructions received by females were hypothesized to have significantly higher influence on ability, effort, and success attributions.

To examine attribution ratings between participants in the gender-consistent and inconsistent groups, t tests were used. Females receiving gender-consistent instructions had significantly higher ratings on ability ($t = 2.0$, $df = 61$, $p < .05$, two tailed), effort ($t = 2.2$, $df = 61$, $p < .05$, two tailed), and success ($t = 2.7$, $df = 61$, $p < .001$, two tailed). Males receiving gender-consistent

instructions also scored significantly higher on ability (t = 1.77, df = 38, p < .08, two tailed) and on success (t = 2.04, df = 38, p < .05, two tailed). Achievement motivation scores were significant predictors of performance in the feminine and neutral conditions [for the feminine condition; R = .45, $F(1,29)$ = 7.78, p < .01 and for the neutral condition; R = .45, $F(1,21)$ = 4.48, p < .05]. The interaction (relationship) between FOS and achievement motivation for the masculine condition (females in the masculine instruction group) was statistically significant [R = .61, $F(1, 26)$ = 12.05, p < .001]. For males in the masculine group, the interaction (relationship) between FOS and achievement motivation was statistically significant [R = .47, $F(1, 17)$ = 4.04, p < .10]. For the entire sample, high-FOS-high-achievement motivation subjects attributed less of their performance to internal qualities in the masculine group than did low-FOS-high-achievement subjects (ts = -1.6, -2.36, df = 11, ps < .07 and .01, one tailed, respectively). In the neutral condition, high-FOS-high-achievement subjects attributed more effort to their performance than their low-FOS counterparts (t = 2.2, df = 11, p < .05, two tailed). High-FOS-high-

achievement individuals attributed more effort to their performance in the feminine condition ($t = 3.32$, $df = 8$, $p < .01$, two tailed) and neutral condition ($t = 2.31$, $df = 5$, $p < .07$, two tailed), more so than those in the masculine condition.

Zuckerman and Allison (1976) investigated the relationship among FOS, measures of performance, and causal attribution toward success and failure by studying 3 samples of people. Sample 1 consisted of 183 male and 193 female undergraduate students, sample 2 consisted of 107 males and 95 females, and sample 3 consisted of 36 males and 30 females. Sample 1 was administered the Fear of Success Scale (FOSS), Mehrabian's Scale of Resultant Achievement Motivation and a 13 anagram test in which each word was on a separate page of a booklet. On the first page, one of two sets of instructions were written. One set of instructions was designed to create a low level of motivation while the other was to create a high level of motivation. Following the anagram test, all subjects were asked to rate on a 9 point scale how important it was for them to do well on the test.

Results from the study by Zuckerman and Allison indicated that

high FOS individuals performed poorer than low FOS subjects on the anagram test. High FOS individuals reported that success was less important to them than medium FOS and low FOS subjects. Also, high FOS subjects were more extensionally oriented toward success and more intensionally oriented toward failure. The results ".....were the same for males and females and were maintained even when achievement motivation was controlled....." (p. 429). The relationships among the FOSS, measures of performance, and attribution toward success scores were not statistically significant.

Gender, Bem Sex Role, and Fear of Success

Kearney (1984) investigated the difference in FOS of men and women. The sample included 108 female and 86 male students at George Washington University. Participants were administered the Fear of Success Scale developed by Good and Good. Differences for total scores were assessed using *t* tests.

Results indicated no statistically significant difference between the mean FOS scores for females and males. A primary concern of both female and male students, ".....appear to be that

high achievement would provoke negative feelings toward them from others and a concern that success brings with it undersirable stress factors" (p. 1006). Secondary concerns for fearing achievement were that interpersonal relationships would suffer and other people might take advantage of the achiever.

Using Horner's FOS scale, Gravenkemper and Paludi (1979) studied 64 females and 79 males in introductory psychology classes at the University of Cincinnati. It was hypothesized that when allowed to define success for themselves, the sample would exhibit little FOS and would not show a significant difference in the amount of FOS projected by either gender. Subjects were given booklets containing 1 of 2 ambiguous cues ("John has succeeded" or Anne has succeeded"). Thirty-six females and 29 males were given the John cue while 43 females and 35 males received the Anne cue. Two raters scored the responses with an interrater reliability of 99%.

The results indicated a low incidence of FOS imagery for both men and women; however, FOS was exhibited slightly more by men than women. The researchers found that 14.1% of the men and

7.6% of the women had high FOS scores ($p < .05$ level).

Mulig, Haggerty, Carballosa, Cinnick, and Madden (1985) studied the relationships between fear of succes, fear of failure, and androgony. The sample consisted of 108 male and 46 female undergraduate students enrolled in general psychology classes at a private university. The mean age was 18.9 years and the data were collected in the fall of 1980.

The procedure involved completing two questionnaires. The first consisted of items from the FOSS and the Debilitating Anxiety Scale (DAS) listed together in random order, and the second assessment administered was the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). Mulig et. al. sought to confirm a relationship between the FOSS and the DAS. In addition, the researchers sought to confirm a relationship among the BSRI catagories and the FOSS and the DAS.

To investigate a relationship between FOS and fear of failure, a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the FOSS and the DAS scores. The coefficient, $r = .45$, was significant at the .001 level. Correlation coefficients were then computed for men and women separately

between the FOSS and the DAS scores. The coefficients (for women, r = .62, and for men, r = .35) were both significant at the .001 level. This suggested that FOS was a gender-related construct in that it was significantly stronger for women than men.

Cano, Solomon, and Holmes (1984) studied the relationship between BSRI catagories and FOS scores using 80 female and 124 male undergraduate students at the University of Kansas. Each participant completed the BSRI, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), and the Sadd FOS Scale.

The authors concluded that FOS related to the absence of masculine traits more than the presence of feminine traits. High FOS scores related to low scores on self confidence (t = 6.27, p < .001 level), decisiveness (t = 2.52, p = < .13 level), analytical skills (t = 2.37, p < .019 level), and independence (t = 2.19, p < .029 level). Masculine and androgynous participants had lower levels of FOS than feminine and undifferentiated participants. Gender was not associated with FOS scores.

Pyke and Kahill (1983) investigated the differences between

male and female doctors on four variables: fear of success, role conflict, professional marginality, and domestic responsibilities. Questionnaires were distributed to 382 female and 866 male physicians. This report was based on information taken from married participants (50 women and 54 men). The author did not report the number of responses. The FOS instrument employed in this study was developed by Spence using a Likert-type scale. The results indicated men had a significantly higher mean score on the fear of success scale than women.

Farmer and Fyans (1983) studied the relationship of FOS and Bem Sex Role of married students returning to college after an absence. The sample consisted of 162 women. The women were first and second year liberal arts students at two state colleges in the midwest. The first year students were higher in androgynous sex types and were older. Subjects were administered the Horner's verbal leads and the BSRI.

The results indicated feminine sex type subjects rating high in both career and achievement motivation were also high on the FOS scale. Androgynous and masculine sex types rating high in

career and achievement motivation did not have high FOS scale scores. Undifferentiated sex types had high FOS scale scores.

Self-Esteem and Fear of Success

No studies were found pertaining to self-esteem and fear of success.

Age and Fear of Success

Freilino and Hummel (1985) studied fear of success using 20 undergraduate college women between the ages of 18 and 23 years and 20 undergraduate women over the age of 30 years enrolled at a private women's college. Fear of success was measured by Horner's cue about Anne. Subjects also completed the FOS questionnaire designed by Spence.

It was hypothesized that adult women would exhibit less FOS than college age women. This hypothesis was confirmed by both FOS instruments. A t test (t - 2.54, $p < 0.01$) of the adult versus college age means on the Spence instrument further supported the hypothesis.

College Classification and Fear of Success

No studies were found pertaining to college classification

and fear of success.

Grade Point Average and Fear of Success

No studies were found pertaining to grade point average and fear of success.

Family Structure and Fear of Success

No studies were found pertaining to family structure and fear of success.

Summary

In summary, results of studies have demonstrated the prevalence of FOS. Originally thought to be a gender related construct pertaining to women, studies also found FOS was experienced by men, sometimes even more so than by women. Recent researchers have attributed FOS more to the Bem Sex Role, according to Bem (1985), for individuals who are traditional feminine or undifferentiated than for traditional masculine or androgynous individuals.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the researcher was to investigate fear of success in community college students.

Importance of the Research

The results of the present study might benefit college counselors, staff, administrators, and faculty. The results can be used locally and by college personnel through implementation of future instruction. By understanding what FOS is and how to identify it educators, counselors, and psychologists will be able to confront those factors that indicate FOS. This will enable students and clients to become more aware of the FOS and take control of their attitudes, expectations, and reality as it is and not how they have perceived it.

In 1988, 33% of the student body at Colby Community College had a high school cumulative grade point average of C or below. Due to the knowledge educators may gain about FOS, teachers may view various learning styles differently and modify their teaching techniques accordingly.

The results of the present study provided infomation pertaining to the following questions:

1. Is there an association between gender and fear of success?

2. Is there an association between Bem Sex Role and fear of success?
3. Is there an association between self-esteem and fear of success?
4. Is there an association between age and fear of success?
5. Is there an association between college classification and fear of success?
6. Is there an association between grade point average (GPA) and fear of success?
7. Is there an association between family structure and fear of success?

Composite Null Hypotheses

All null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. The differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to the Bem Sex Role, self-esteem and gender will not be statistically significant.

2. The differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to the Bem Sex Role, self-esteem and age will not be statistically significant.
3. The differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to self-esteem, gender and age will not be statistically significant.
4. The differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale score according to the Bem Sex Role, gender and age will not be statistically significant.
5. The differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale score according to college classification, grade point average and family structure will not be statistically significant.

Definition of Variables

Independent variables were self-reported on a demographic sheet, the Bem Sex Role Inventory, and the Personal Attributes Inventory.

Independent Variables

The independent variables were:

1. gender - two levels,
    a. male, and
    b. female;
2. Bem Sex Role - four levels,
    a. traditional feminine,
    b. traditional masculine,
    c. androgynous, and
    d. undifferentiated;
3. self-esteem - two levels (levels determined post hoc),
    a. high (scores ranging from 24 - 30), and
    b. low (scores ranging from 0 - 23);
4. age - two levels,
    a. traditional - less than 25 years of age, and
    b. nontraditional - 25 years of age and older;

5. college classification - two levels,
   a. freshman (fewer than 30 credit hours), and
   b. sophomore (30 credit hours or more);
6. grade point average - three levels (levels determined post hoc),
   a. high (3.0 - 4.0),
   b. average (2.0 - 2.9),
   c. low (0.0 - 1.9); and
7. family structure - two levels (levels determined post hoc),
   a. intact, and
   b. other (living with biological mother and stepfather, biological father and stepmother, mother only, father only, grandparents, etc.)

Dependent variable

The dependent variable was scores from the Fear of Success Scale (FOSS) by M. Zuckerman and S. Allison (1976).

Limitations

The following conditions might have affected the outcome of

the present study:

1. the sample was not random,
2. all subjects came from the same geographic location (western and midwest of the United States), and
3. all information was self-reported by questionnaire.

Methodology

Setting

Colby Community College, in Thomas County, opened it's doors to the public in the fall semester, 1964, in the old Cooper Hotel and received accreditation from the North Central Association in 1972. The curriculum originally offered was economics, business, English, fine arts, life sciences, modern language, physical science, mathematics, social science and psychology ("Colby Community", 1964). Colby Community College enrollment for Fall, 1991, numbered approximately 1,200 students, of which 850 were fulltime, on campus. Approximately 450 were female and 400 were male. The average age was 27 years (Cornell, 1989).

Other facts about Colby Community College (Cornell, 1989)

include: 42% of students came from families earning less than $10,000 per year, 60% were first generation students, 98% were from rural areas and isolated by geography, 33% had cumulative high school grade point averages of C or below, 27% intended to transfer to a four year college, and 52% expected to get grades of B or lower their first term at Colby.

Colby Community College is located in Colby, which is a town of approximately 5,000 people, in the northwest corner of Kansas. It serves primarily the people of Thomas County and the 13 surrounding counties.

The service area is predominantly rural with farming and ranching as the major industries. Economic recession has occurred and affected the area due to the fall in the grain and livestock market.

Subjects

A copy of all enrollees was provided by the Registrar's Office. The sample was students enrolled in 13 classes. All students present were included on a voluntary basis. Of the 250 students surveyed, 90 did not complete all of the independent

variable questions on the demographic sheet and therefore could not be used in the present study. The sample consisted of 160 students. Of these, 62 were male, 98 were female, 146 were traditional students, 14 were nontraditional students, 156 were fulltime students, 4 were parttime students, 102 were freshmen, and 58 were sophomores. In addition, 122 were caucasian, 26 were Native American, 5 were Asian American, 4 were Hispanic, and 2 were listed as "other". Sixteen were married, 138 were single, and 6 were divorced. Ninety were employed parttime, 16 worked fulltime, and 54 were not employed.

There appeared to be a misunderstanding by participants concerning the completion of one item on the demographic sheet. Two types of information were asked for under the heading "Academic Status". The information asked for was fulltime/parttime and freshman/sophomore. Eighty-eight students did not answer both parts. They either completed the fulltime/parttime item or the freshman/sophomore item. A response of unclassified should have been added for those students neither classified as freshmen or sophomores. Two other students

did not adequately complete the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Personal Attribute Inventory to exclude them from participation in this study.

Instruments

Four instruments were employed. They were the following:

1. Fear of Success Scale (FOSS);
2. Bem Sex Role Inventory, Short Form (BSRI);
3. Personal Attribute Inventory; and
4. a demographic sheet.

Fear of Success Scale (FOSS). Zuckerman and Allison (1976) developed the Fear of Success Scale (FOSS) to investigate subject differences in the motive to avoid success. The FOSS is a 27 item instrument with a 7-point Likert-type scale. Of the 27 statements, 16 are worded so that agreement indicated high fear of success (FOS) while disagreement indicated high FOS for the remaining items. Items describe the benefits of success, the cost of success, and attitude toward success. Possible scores are from 27 to 189 with high scores indicating high FOS.

Of the 27 statements, the researchers employed 3 samples in

the development and refinement of the instrument. They used 183 male and 193 female undergraduate subjects in the first sample, 107 males and 95 females in sample 2, and 36 males and 30 females in sample 3. Horner's Measure of Fear of Success was then administered to samples 1 and 3. In both samples women scored statistically higher (at the .05 level) than did men on the FOSS. Samples 1 and 2 were administered the Mehrabian's Scale of Resultai Achievement Motivation. Separate forms were used for men and women, but overall, the results indicated a negative relationship between FOS and achievement motivation. Among women:

> .....correlations between the FOSS and Mehrabian's Scale were -.23 ($p < .01$) in Sample 1 and -.21 ($p < .05$) in Sample 2. Among males, correlations between the FOSS and Mehrabian's Scale were -.08 (n.s.) in Sample 1 and -.20 ($p < .05$) in Sample 2. (p. 425)

Correlation coefficients for the FOSS were .69 for males and .73 for females. The results on Samples 1, 2, and 3 showed women scored significantly higher on the FOSS than men. Content validity was determined by ascertaining the factor loading of each item to

the total score of the instrument (Appendix C).

Bem Sex Role Inventory, Short Form (BSRI). The BSRI, Short Form, developed by Bem, classifies subjects into four types of sex role orientation: androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated (Bem, 1985). The 30 item assessment uses a Likert-type scale of 1 to 7 on which participants rate sex identity characteristics.

Test-retest reliability showed consistency over time. In a 1973 study, 28 males and 28 females were administered the BSRI on two separate occasions, 4 weeks apart (Bem, 1973, cited in Bem, 1985). Reliability coefficints were .76 for males and .94 for females. Internal consistency coefficients were .75 for females and .90 for males, thus demonstrating the items were consistent within themselves. Results of empirical research supported the construct validity of the BSRI. The BSRI classifications have been used as operational definitions in numerous studies involving experimental hypotheses.

Personal Attributes Inventory. The Personal Attributes Inventory (PAI) consists of 50 positive and 50 negative adjectives

from Gough's Adjective Check List. The examinee is to select 30 adjectives which best describe a target group or the person him/herself. The instrument can be scored according to the number of positive words selected or the number of negative words selected. When scoring employing positive words, scores can range from 0 (very negative) to 30 (very positive) and when scoring from negative words selected, scores may range from 0 (very positive) to 30 (very negative).

Parish, Bryant, and Shirazi (1976) reported test-retest reliability coefficients for 3 samples taken at Oklahoma State Univeristy. The reliability coefficients were r = .90, r = .94 and r = .95. In the second study, 16 male and 34 female college students were administered the same instrument 4 weeks apart. Test-retest validity showed a correlation coefficient of .83. Correlation coefficients for criterion-related validity with the Westie Summated Differences Scale was .46 (p < .001 level). Coefficients obtained using the Ewens Adjective Check List were .55 (p < .01 level) and .66 (p < .001 level).

Parish, Eads, and Adams (1977) reported that the PAI could

also be used to measure self-concept when using the inventory to describe oneself. Using two subscales, "favorable" and "unfavorable", two studies were performed. The first used 42 undergraduate (6 males, 36 females) college students who were administered the PAI and the Adjective Check List. Correlation coefficients were obtained of .80 ($p < .001$ level) on the "unfavorable" subscale and -.73 ($p < .001$ level) on the "favorable" subscale.

Demographic Sheet. A demographic sheet was developed by the researcher. The demographic sheet provided information pertaining to gender, major course of study, ethnic background, marital status, age, academic status, employment status, grade point average and family structure.

Design

A status survey factorial design was employed. The following independent variables were investigated: gender, Bem Sex Role, self-esteem, age, college classification, grade point average, and family structure. The dependent variable employed was FOS scores. The following designs were employed with

composite null hypotheses 1 - 5:

composite null hypothesis number 1, a 4 x 2 x 2 factoral design;

composite null hypothesis number 2, a 4 x 2 x 2 factoral design;

composite null hypothesis number 3, a 2 x 2 x 2 factoral design;

composite null hypothesis number 4, a 4 x 2 x 2 factoral design; and

composite null hypothesis number 5, a 2 x 3 x 2 factoral design.

McMillan & Schumacher (1984) cited 10 threats to internal validity. Threats to internal validity were dealt with in the following ways in the present study:

1. history - did not pertain because the study was status survey;
2. selection - all available subjects who met participation criteria were included and results were used from all questionnaires which were

completed;

3. statistical regression - did not pertain because subjects were not extreme;
4. testing - did not pertain because the study was status survey;
5. instrumentation - did not pertain because the study was status survey;
6. mortality - did not pertain because the study was status survey;
7. maturation - did not pertain because the study was status survey;
8. diffusion of treatment - did not pertain because no treatment was administered;
9. experimenter bias - no treatment was implemented, and instruments were administered by standard approved procedures; and
10. statistical conclusions - two mathematical assumptions were violated (random sampling and equal numbers in cells); the general linear model

was used to correct for lack of equal numbers in cells and the researcher did not project beyond the statistical procedures employed.

McMillan and Schumacher (1984) cited 2 threats to external validity. Threats to external validity were dealt with in the following ways:

1. population external validity - the sample was not random; therefore, the results should be generalized only to groups similar to the subjects; and
2. ecological external validity - no treatment was implemented and instruments were administered by standard procedures.

Data Collecting Procedures

A letter was written to the Dean of Instruction (Appendix I) requesting permission to survey 3 introductory psychology classes, 4 human growth and development classes, 1 abnormal psychology class, 1 marriage and family class, 1 gerontology class, and 3 introductory sociology classes. Before administering the

instruments, letters were written requesting permission to use the Fear of Success Scale (Appendix G) and the Personal Attribute Inventory (Appendix H).

The following instruments were administered: a demographic sheet, the FOSS, PAI, and BSRI. Half of the packets were arranged by order of the demographic sheet, BSRI, PAI, and the FOSS. The other half were arranged with the FOSS first, the PAI second, the BSRI third, and the demographic sheet last. An instruction sheet was attached to the front of each packet (Appendix A). After the packets were distributed, instructions were read to the classes. Students were instructed to keep their instruments until all were finished.

There appeared to be a misunderstanding by participants concerning the completion of one item on the demographic sheet. Two types of information were asked for under the heading "Academic Status". The information asked for was fulltime/parttime and freshman/sophomore. Eighty-eight students did not answer both parts. They either completed the fulltime/parttime item or the freshman/sophomore item. A

response of unclassified should have been added for those students neither classified as freshmen or sophomores. Two other students did not adequately complete the Personal Attribute Inventory and the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Because of this, those 90 students were not included in this study.

Research Procedures

The following steps were implemented:

1. review of the literature in the areas of fear of success (2 computer searches were made and compiled);
2. instruments were selected;
3. a research proposal was written, presented, and defended to the thesis committee;
4. data were collected;
5. data were analyzed;
6. the final report was written;
7. the thesis was defended; and
8. a final copy of the thesis was compiled and edited.

Data Analysis

The following were compiled:

1. appropriate descriptive statistics,
2. three-way analysis of variance (general linear model),
3. Bonferroni (Dunn) t test for means, and
4. Duncan's multiple range test for means.

Results

The purpose of the researcher was to investigate fear of success in community college students. The sample consisted of 160 students of which 62 were males and 98 were females. One hundred and forty-six were traditional students, 14 were nontraditional students, 102 were freshmen, and 58 were sophomores. The independent variables investigated were gender, Bem Sex Role, self-esteem, age, college classification, grade point average, and family structure. The dependent variable was fear of success scores. Five composite null hypotheses were tested using three-way analysis of variance. The following designs were employed with composite null hypotheses 1 - 5:

composite null hypothesis number 1, a 4 x 2 x 2 factorial

design;

composite null hypothesis number 2, a 4 x 2 x 2 factorial design;

composite null hypothesis number 3, a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design;

composite null hypothesis number 4, a 4 x 2 x 2 factorial design; and

composite null hypothesis number 5, a 2 x 3 x 2 factorial design.

The results section was organized according to composite null hypotheses for ease of reference. Information pertaining to each hypothesis was presented in a common format.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number 1 that the differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to the Bem Sex Role, self-esteem, and gender would not be statistically significant. Information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number 1 was presented in Table 1. The following were cited in Table 1: variables, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, F values, and p levels.

Table 1: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to the Bem Sex Role, Self-Esteem, and Gender Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance

Variables	n	M*	s	F Value	p Level
Gender (A)					
Male	62	98.9	15.24[a]	3.85	.0515
Female	98	105.7	13.85[b]		
Bem Sex Role (B)					
Traditional Female	56	107.3	13.62	1.29	.2792
Traditional Male	23	98.0	20.11		
Androgyneous	62	101.3	14.02		
Undifferentiated	19	102.0	9.52		
Self-Esteem (C)					
High**	101	102.5	14.10	0.95	.3302
Low	59	104.0	15.84		
Interactions					
A x B				0.25	.8588
A x C				0.00	.9576
B x C				0.15	.9280
A x B x C				0.32	.8081

*The larger the value, the greater the fear of success (the possible scores were 27 to 186 with a theoretical mean of 108).
**High = scores from 24 to 30, Low = 23 or less (Parish's Personal Attribute Inventory).
[ab] Difference statistically significant at the .05 level according to Bonferroni (Dunn) t test for means.

One of the 7 p values was statistically significant at the

.05 level; therefore, the null hypothesis for this comparison was rejected. The significant comparison was for the independent variable gender. The information cited in Table 1 indicated females reported statistically greater fear of success than males.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number 2 that the differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to the Bem Sex Role, self-esteem and age would not be statistically significant. Information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number 2 was presented in Table 2. The following were cited in Table 2: variables, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, F values, and p levels.

Table 2: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scores for College Students According to the Bem Sex Role, Self-Esteem, and Age Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance

Variables	n	M*	s	F Value	p Level
Bem Sex Role (B)					
Traditional Female	56	107.3	13.62		
Traditional Male	23	98.0	20.11	1.84	.1422
Androgyneous	62	101.3	14.02		
Undifferentiated	19	102.0	9.52		
Self-Esteem (C)					
High**	101	102.5	14.10	1.63	.2039
Low	59	104.0	16.00		
Age (D)					
Traditional(<25 yr)	146	102.7	14.63	0.61	.4375
Nontraditional (25+)	14	106.0	16.07		
Interactions					
B x C				0.07	.9737
B x D				0.63	.5994
C x D				0.38	.5410
B x C x D				0.40	.5303

* The larger the value, the greater the fear of success (the possible scores were 27 to 186 with a theoretical mean of 108).
** High = scores from 24 to 30, Low = 23 or less (Parish's Personal Attribute Inventory)

None of the 7 p values were statistically significant at the

.05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were retained. The information cited in Table 2 indicated no associations between independent and dependent variables.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number 3 that the differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to self-esteem, gender, and age would not be statistically significant. Information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number 3 was presented in Table 3. The following were cited in Table 3: variables, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, F values, and p levels.

Table 3: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to Self-Esteem, Gender, and Age Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance

Variables	n	M*	s	F Value	p Level
Gender (A)					
Male	62	98.9	15.24	1.03	.3123
Female	98	105.7	14.00		
Self-Esteem (C)					
High**	101	102.5	14.10	0.37	.5419
Low	59	104.0	15.84		
Age (D)					
Traditional(<25 yr)	146	102.7	14.63	0.06	.8017
Nontraditional(25+)	14	105.9	16.10		
Interactions					
A x C				0.05	.8289
A x D				0.00	.9923
C x D				0.03	.8524
A x C x D				***	***

* The larger the value, the greater the fear of success (the possible scores were 27 to 186 with a theoretical mean of 108).
** High = scores from 24 to 30, Low = 23 or less (Parish's Personal Attribute Inventory).
*** Analysis not completed because of sample size.

None of the 7 p values were statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons

were retained. The information cited in Table 3 indicated no associations between independent and dependent variables.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number 4 that the differences among the mean Fear of Success Scale scores according to the Bem Sex Role, gender, and age would not be statistically significant. Information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number 4 was presented in Table 4. The following were cited in Table 4: variables, sample sizes, means, stantard deviations, F values, and p levels.

Table 4: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scores for College Students According to the Bem Sex Role, Gender, and Age Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance

Variables	n	M*	s	F Value	p Level
Gender (A)					
Male	62	98.9[a]	15.24	3.99	.0475
Female	98	105.7[b]	13.85		
Bem Sex Role (B)					
Traditional Female	56	107.3	13.62		
Traditional Male	23	98.0	20.11	1.92	.1293
Androgymeous	62	101.3	14.02		
Undifferentiated	19	102.0	9.52		
Age (D)					
Traditional (<25 yr)	146	102.7	14.63	0.11	.7385
Nontraditional (25+)	14	105.9	16.08		
Interactions					
A x B				0.03	.9912
A x D				**	**
B x D				0.47	.6238
A x B x D				**	**

* The larger the value, the greater the fear of success (the possible scores were 27 to 186 with a theoretical mean of 108).
** Analysis not completed because of sample size.
[ab] Difference statistically significant at the .05 level according to Bonferroni (Dunn) t test.

One of the 7 p values was statistically significant at the .05

level; therefore, the null hypothesis for this comparison was rejected. The significant comparison was for the main effect gender (recurring, Table 1). The information cited in Table 4 indicated no new associations between independent and dependent variables.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number 5 that the differences among the mean Fear of Success scores according to college classification, grade point average and family structure would not be statistically significant. Information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number 5 was presented in Table 5. The following were cited in Table 5: variables, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, F values, and p levels.

Table 5: A Comparison of Mean Fear of Success Scale Scores for College Students According to College Classification, Grade Point Average, and Family Structure Employing a Three-Way Analysis of Variance

Variables	n	M*	s	F Value	p Level
College Classification (E)					
Freshman**	102	102.0	15.67	0.11	.7446
Sophomore	58	104.8	12.85		
Grade Point Average (F)					
High (3.0 - 4.0)	55	101.8	15.70		
Average (2.0 - 2.9)	71	102.4	14.00	0.74	.4794
Low (0.0 - 1.9)	34	106.3	14.57		
Family Structure (G)					
Intact***	127	103.1	14.66	0.65	.4217
Other	33	102.8	15.25		
Interactions					
E x F				2.66	.0732
E x G				0.31	.5798
F x G				0.39	.6800
E x F x G				0.58	.4486

* The larger the value, the greater the fear of success (the possible scores were 27 to 186 with a theoretical mean of 108).

** Fulltime status comprised of fewer than 30 credit hours.

*** Intact = Living with biological father and biological mother, Other = Living with biological mother and stepfather, biological father and stepmother, mother only, father only, grandparents, and other).

None of the 7 p values were statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were retained. The information cited in Table 5 indicated no associations between independent and dependent variables.

Discussion

Summary

The purpose of the researcher was to study fear of success among community college students. The sample included 160 students, 98 females and 62 males. The independent variables were gender, Bem Sex Role, self-esteem, age, college classification, grade point average, and family structure. The dependent variable was fear of success scores. Five composite null hypotheses were tested using three-way analysis of variance.

A total of 19 comparisons plus 13 recurring comparisons were made. Of the 19 comparisons, 7 were for main effects and 12 were for interactions. Of the 7 main effects, one was statistically significant at the .05 level. The significant main effect was for gender. The results indicated females had statistically more FOS than males. None of the 12 interactions were statistically

significant at the .05 level.

Related Literature and Results of the Present Study

The results from the study by Kearney (1984) indicated no statistically significant difference between mean FOS scores for men and women. The results of the present study did not support those reported by Kearney. The researcher found a statistically significant association between gender and FOS scores at the .05 level. Females reported statistically greater FOS than males.

Mulig, Haggerty, Carballosa, Cinnick, and Madden (1985) reported findings which indicated gender and FOS scores were associated variables. The results of the present study appeared to support the findings of Mulig, et. al.

Cano, Solomon, and Holmes (1984) studied the relationship between the Bem Sex Role and FOS scores. They found a statistically significant association between FOS scores and the Bem Sex Role. The results indicated the traditional feminine type had a statistically higher mean FOS score. The results of the present research did not support these findings in that no statistically significant association was found between the Bem

Sex Role and FOS scores. Farmer and Fyans (1983) also reported results from a study of the Bem Sex Role and FOS scores. Their results indicated traditional feminine and undifferentiated sex types had a statistically higher mean FOS score than did traditional masculine and androgynous sex types. The results of the present study did not support those reported by Farmer and Fyans in that no association was found between the Bem Sex Role and FOS scores.

Pyke and Kahill (1983) found a significantly higher mean FOS score for male than for female physicians. However, the results of the present study indicated the opposite of Pyke and Kahill for males and females.

Freilino and Hummel (1985) studied age and FOS in a sample of college students. They reported a significant association between age and FOS scores. Their findings indicated students under 23 years of age exhibited higher FOS than students over 30 years of age. The results of the present study did not support these findings in that no association was found between age and FOS.

Generalizations

The results of the present study appeared to support the following generalizations:

1. females have more fear of success than males.
2. no association between the Bem Sex Role types and fear of success,
3. no association between self-esteem and fear of success,
4. no association between age and fear of success,
5. no association between college classification and fear of success,
6. no association between grade point average and fear of success, and
7. no association between family structure and fear of success.

Recommendations

There appeared to be a misunderstanding by participants concerning the completion of one item on the demographic sheet. Two types of information were asked for under the heading

"Academic Status". The information asked for was fulltime/parttime and freshman/sophomore. Eighty-eight students did not answer both parts. They either completed the fulltime/parttime item or the freshman/sophomore item. In addition, a response of unclassified should have been added for those students neither classified as freshmen or sophomores. Copies of the questionnaires from 2 students were too incomplete to be used. The results of the present study appear to support the following recommendations:

1. The study should be replicated using a modified demographic sheet (separate the "Academic Status" section into two sections called "College Classification" and "Enrollment Status", as well as add the item called "unclassified" under "College Classification").
2. The study should be replicated with a large random sample.
3. The study should be replicated employing subjects from more than one community college.
4. The study should be replicated employing subjects

from four-year colleges.

5. The study should be replicated using different instructions.
6. The study should be replicated using self-reporting data acquired by interviews.
7. The study should be replicated using high school students.
8. The study should be replicated using junior high school students.

References

Bem, S. (1985). Bem sex role inventory. Test Critiques, 1, 51-57.

Cano, L., Solomon, S., & Holmes, D. (1984). Fear of success: The influence of sex, sex-role identity, and components of masculinity. Sex Roles, 10(5/6), 341-346.

Colby Community College Catalog, (1964). Colby, KS.

Cornell, C. (1989). Student Support Services (Report No. EP042A00735). Colby, KS: Colby Community College.

Farmer, H.S., & Fyans, L.J. (1983). Married women's achievement and career motivation: The influence of some environmental and psychological variables. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 7 (4), 358-372.

Freilino, M.K., & Hummel, R. (1985). Achievement and identity in college-age vs. adult women students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14 (1), 1-10.

Gravenkemper, S.A., & Paludi, M.A. (1979). Fear of success revisited: Introducing an ambiguous cue. Sex Roles, 9 (8), 897-900.

Itzkowitz, S. and Petrie, D. (1982). Fear of success in gay women. Journal of NAWDAC, 46 (1), 26-31.

Kearney, M. (1984). A comparison of motivation to avoid success in males and females. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40 (4), 1005-1007.

McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1984). Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Mulig, J.C., Haggerty, M.E., Carballosa, A.B., Cinnick, W.J., & Madden, J.M. (1985). Relationships among fear of success, fear of failure, and androgyny. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 284-287.

Paludi, M.A. (1984). Psychometric properties and underlying assumptions of four objective measures of fear of success. Sex Roles, 10 (9/10), 765 - 781.

Pappo, M. (1983). Fear of success: The construction and validation of a measuring instrument. Journal of Personality Assessment, 47, 36 - 41.

Parish, T.S.; Bryant, W.T.; and Shirazi, A. (1976). The personal attribute inventory. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 42, 715 - 720.

Parish, T.S.; Eads, G.M.; and Adams, D.E. (1977). The personal attribute inventory as a self-concept scale: A preliminary report. Psychological Reports, 41, 1141-1142.

Piedmont, R.L. (1988). An interactional model of achievement motivation and fear of success. Sex Roles, 19 (7/8), 467-490.

Pyke, S.W., & Kahill, S.P. (1983). Sex differences in characteristics presumed relevant to professional productivity. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 8 (2), 189 - 192.

Zuckerman, M., & Allison, S.N. (1976). An objective measure of fear of success: Construction and validation. Journal of Personality Assessment, 40 (4), 422-430.

APPENDIX A

Instruction Sheet

The following study is being conducted to assess fear of success on the community college level. All information is confidential and will be used in group analysis only. On each instrument, instructions have been written to assist you in completing all items. You must answer all items for the information to be usable. Participation is voluntary. If you wish to not participate, please raise your hand. Questions are permitted at any time.

APPENDIX B

Fear of Success Scale

As Used

Fear of Success Scale*

In this questionnaire, you will find a number of statements. For each statement, a scale from 1 to 7 is provided, with 1 representing extreme disagreement and 7 representing extreme agreement. This is a measure of personal attitude. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer all items. For your results to be used, all items must be answered.

1. I expect other people to fully appreciate my potential.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Often the cost of success is greater than the reward.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. For every winner there are several rejected and unhappy losers.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. The only way I can prove my worth is by winning a game or doing well on a task.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I enjoy telling my friends that I have done something especially well.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. It is more important to play the game than to win it.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. In my attempt to do better than others, I realize I might lose many of my friends.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. In competition I try to win no matter what.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. A person who is at the top faces nothing but a constant struggle to stay there.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I am happy only when I am doing better than others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I think "success" has been emphasized too much in our culture.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. In order to achieve one must give up the fun things in life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. The cost of success is overwhelming responsibility.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Achievement commands respect.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I become embarrassed when others compliment me on my work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. A successful person is often considered by others to be both aloof and snobbish.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. When you're on top, everyone looks up to you.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. People's behavior change for the worst after they become successful.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. When competing against another person, I sometimes feel better if I lose than if I win.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. Once you're on top, everyone is your buddy and no one is your friend.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. When you're the best, all doors are open.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Even when I do well on a task, I sometimes feel like a phony or a fraud.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I believe that successful people are often sad and lonely.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. The rewards of a successful competition are greater than those received from cooperation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. When I am on top the responsibility makes me feel uneasy.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. It is extremely important for me to do well in all things that I undertake.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. I believe I will be more successful than most of the people I know.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*From Zuckerman, M. and Allison, S.N. (1976). An objective measure of fear of success: Construction and validation. Journal of Personality Assessment, 40, (4), 422 - 430.

APPENDIX C

Fear of Success Scale

Statistics

Fear of Success Scale

The following are correlation coefficients between each item and the total score, based upon a sample of 183 males and 193 females. (Zuckerman, M. and Allison, S.N., 1976, p. 422 - 430)

		Males	Females
1.	I expect other people to fully appreciate my potential.(L)**	.11	.23
2.	Often the cost of success is greater than the reward. (H)*	.40	.44
3.	For every winner there are several rejected and unhappy losers. (H)	.15	.15
4.	The only way I can prove my worth is by winning a game or doing well on a task. (L)	.15	.08
5.	I enjoy telling my friends that I have done something especially well. (L)	.09	.18
6.	It is more important to play the game than to win it. (H)	.17	.24

7.	In my attempt to do better than others, I realize I may lose many of my friends. (H)	.31	.33
8.	In competition I try to win no matter what. (L)	.32	.29
9.	A person who is at the top faces nothing but a constant struggle to stay there. (H)	.27	.12
10.	I am happy only when I am doing better than others. (L)	.11	.13
11.	I think "success" has been emphasized too much in our culture. (H)	.29	.42
12.	In order to achieve one must give up the fun things in life. (H)	.22	.22
13.	The cost of success is overwhelming responsibility. (H)	.16	.17
14.	Achievement commands respect. (L)	.16	.15

15. I become embarrased when others compliment me on my work. (H)	.25	.27
16. A successful person is often considered by others to be both aloof and snobbish. (H)	.19	.34
17. When you're on top, everyone looks up to you. (L)	.12	.20
18. People's behavior change for the worst after they become successful. (H)	.37	.29
19. When competing against another person, I sometimes feel better if I lose than if I win. (H)	.29	.35
20. Once you're on top, everyone is your buddy and no one is your friend. (H)	.27	.21
21. When you're the best, all doors are open. (L)	.19	.10

22. Even when I do well on a task, I sometimes feel like a phony or a fraud. (H)	.34	.33
23. I believe that successful people are often sad and lonely. (H)	.43	.49
24. The rewards of a successful competition are greater than those received from cooperation. (L)	.10	.20
25. When I am on top the responsibility makes me feel uneasy. (H)	.12	.39
26. It is extremely important for me to do well in all things that I undertake. (L)	.28	.26
27. I believe I will be more successful than most of the people I know. (L)	.27	.39

*(H) = High agreement indicates high FOS

**(L) = Disagreement indicates high FOS

APPENDIX D

Personal Attribute Inventory

The Personal Attribute Inventory*

Read through this list and select <u>exactly 30 words</u> (no more, no less) which describe how you feel about yourself. Indicate your selection by placing the numbers 1 through 30 in the appropriate space next to each word.

_____active	_____affectionate	_____alert
_____appreciative	_____awkward	_____bitter
_____calm	_____careless	_____cheerful
_____clearthinking	_____complaining	_____conceited
_____confident	_____confused	_____conscientious
_____cooperative	_____cowardly	_____cruel
_____deceitful	_____dependable	_____despondent
_____determined	_____energetic	_____fairminded
_____fickle	_____foolish	_____foresighted
_____forgetful	_____gloomy	_____good-natured
_____greedy	_____handsome	_____hasty
_____healthy	_____helpful	_____hostile
_____humorous	_____imaginative	_____impatient
_____industrious	_____initiative	_____intolerant
_____inventive	_____irresponsible	_____irritable
_____jolly	_____kind	_____mannerly
_____masculine	_____nagging	_____natural
_____obnoxious	_____organized	_____original
_____patient	_____pleasant	_____poised
_____prejudiced	_____progressive	_____quarrelsome
_____queer	_____quitting	_____rational
_____rattle-brained	_____relaxed	_____resentful
_____resourceful	_____rude	_____self-centered
_____self-confident	_____self-controlled	_____self-pitying
_____selfish	_____shallow	_____shiftless
_____show-off	_____sincere	_____slipshod
_____snobbish	_____spineless	_____stable
_____steady	_____stingy	_____strong
_____sulky	_____sympathetic	_____tactful
_____tactless	_____thankless	_____tolerant
_____touchy	_____trusting	_____undependable
_____understanding	_____unfriendly	_____unintelligent
_____unkind	_____weak	_____whiny
_____warm		

* Parish, T.S.; Bryant, W.T.; and Shirazi, A. (1976). The personal abbribute inventory. <u>Perceptual and Motor Skills</u>, <u>42</u>, 715 - 720.

APPENDIX E

BEM SEX ROLE INVENTORY

SHORT FORM

Bem Sex Role Inventory, Short Form (BSRI)*

The following are a number of personality characteristics. Please use these characteristics to describe yourself. Indicate on a scale from 1 to 7 how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristics unmarked.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
never or almost never true						always or almost always true

_____	1. Independent	_____	17. Sensitive to the needs of others
_____	2. Gentle	_____	18. Moody
_____	3. Adaptable	_____	19. Aggressive
_____	4. Has leadership qualities	_____	20. Eager to soothe hurt feelings
_____	5. Tender	_____	21. Reliable
_____	6. Conscientious	_____	22. Willing to take a stand
_____	7. Assertive	_____	23. Understanding
_____	8. Compassionate	_____	24. Secretive
_____	9. Conceited	_____	25. Defends own beliefs
_____	10. Dominant	_____	26. Affectionate
_____	11. Warm	_____	27. Tactful
_____	12. Conventional	_____	28. Willing to take risks
_____	13. Strong personality	_____	29. Loves children
_____	14. Sympathetic	_____	30. Truthful
_____	15. Jealous		
_____	16. Forceful		

* Bem, S. (1985). Bem sex role inventory. Test Critiques, 1, 51 - 57.

APPENDIX F

Demographic Sheet

Demographic Sheet

Please answer all items so as not to invalidate your surveys.

Age_____

Gender: Male_____ Female_____

Major Course of Study_____

PLEASE CHECK ALL OF THE FOLLOWING WHICH APPLY TO YOU:

Ethnic Background

Native American_____ African American_____ Asian____

Hispanic_____ Caucasian_____ Other__

If other, please specify:_____

Marital Status

Married_____ Single_____ Divorced_____ Widowed_____

Academic Status

Fulltime_____ Parttime_____

Freshman_____ Sophomore_____

Employment Status

Fulltime (35-40+ hr/wk)_____ Parttime (1-34 hr/wk)_____

Not employed_____

Grade Point Average (Cumulative)

0.0 - 0.4_____ 0.5 - 0.9_____ 1.0 - 1.4_____

1.5 - 1.9_____ 2.0 - 2.4_____ 2.5 - 2.9_____

3.0 - 3.4_____ 3.5 - 3.9_____ 4.0_____

Family Structure

I spent most of my time from birth to age 18 in the following family structure:

_____ intact (biological mother and father)

_____ mother and stepfather

_____ father and stepmother

_____ mother only

_____ father only

_____ grandparents

_____ other, please specify:_____

_____

APPENDIX G

Letter to

M. Zuckerman

February 19, 1992

Deanna L. Barnett
HC 1, Box 11
Gem, KS 67734

Mr. Miron Zuckerman
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14604

Dear Mr. Zuckerman:

This is in regards to our phone conversation, 2-19-92, requesting permission to use the Fear of Success Scale for my thesis, pertaining to FOS. This is for completion of the Masters of Science Degree in Counseling at Fort Hays State University in Hays, Kansas.

Thank you for granting this request.

Sincerely,

Deanna L. Barnett

APPENDIX H

Letter to

T. Parish

February 11, 1992

Deanna L. Barnett
HC 1, Box 11
Gem, KS 67734

Dr. Thomas Parish
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506

Dear Dr. Parish:

This is in regards to our phone conversation, 2-7-92, requesting permission to use the Personal Attribute Inventory for my thesis which pertains to FOS. This is for completion of the Master of Science Degree in Counseling at Fort Hays State University in Hays, Kansas.

Thank you for granting my request.

Sincerely,

Deanna L. Barnett

APPENDIX I

Letter to the Dean of

Instruction at Colby

Community College

TO: Mrs. Gracemary Melvin, Dean of Instruction

FROM: Deanna Barnett

RE: Approval to conduct research for thesis in Larry Koon's and Roger Hale's introductory psychology, human growth and development, abnormal psychology,marriage and family, gerontology, and introductory sociology classes.

Currently, I am investigating the relationship between fear of success among gender, age, and freshman/sophomore students, self-esteem, family structure, and gender orientation. This is a request, asking your permission to administer the Personal Attribute Inventory, the Bem Sex Role Inventory, and the Fear of Success Scale to students in Larry Koon's and Roger Hale's introductory psychology, human growth and development, and introductory sociology courses on the CCC campus during the Spring semester, 1992.

Mrs. Melvin, I want to reassure you that the research is not concerned with the scores of any one individual. Individual scores will not appear in the document in any way.

Enclosed is a copy of the research proposal which is still being refined. I apologize for not being able to send you the approved proposal, but will do so following the defense. At this time, the research topic and design have been approved by my thesis advisor, and is being supervised by a very ethical professor at Fort Hays State University.

I appreciate your consideration in this matter and anticipate your reply.